United States District Court UN 2 7 2011 EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA

MOHAMMED KHADER

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Plaintiff,

v. MOHAMMAD ABDELHADI and OMAR LAZKANI CASE NUMBER: 1:10CV01048-(JCC/IDD)

Defendants.

- [X] Jury Verdict. This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.
- [] Decision of the Court. This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Judgment is hereby entered in favor of the Plaintiff, MOHAMMED KHADER, and against the Defendants, MOHAMMAD ABDELHADI and OMAR LAZKANI, in the total amount of \$78,500.

This Judgment is entered in accordance with the attached Jury Verdict dated June 27, 2011.

Date	Fernando Galindo Clerk of Court			
	/s/ Janice Allen (By) Deputy Clerk			

Case 1:10-cv-010	1 DDL-148-JCC -IDD 1 INTTER	Jocument 52 Ververe 1510	Filed 06/27/	11 Page 2 0	13 Page De Court
•	FOR THE F	O STATES DIS EASTERN DIST	BICT OF AN	DURT	
		2101DIQ1DI01	ICI OF AII	CGINIA	JUN 2 7 2011
Mohammed Khade	er,)			P.
	Dl-:-4:66)		Į	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
VS.	Plaintiff,)	VER	DICT	
, •••)	1.10.	-1040 (Yaam	
Mohammad Abdel	lhadi and	, ,	1:100	v1048 (JCC/ID)D)
Omar Lazkani,		ý			•
	D. C. I.)			
	Defendants.)			
•	•				
1. Has plaintiff pr Mohammed Khade	oven by the prepared	onderance of the	evidence that	t there was a co	ontract between
Mohammed Khade	er and Mohammad	d Abdelhadi?			Annual Cocwooll
Yes	N	lo			
		<u> </u>			
TY • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Has plaintiff	proven by the p	reponderance of	f the evidence	e that defend	ant Mohammad
Abdelhadi breache	d the contract?				
Yes 🗸	N	, O			
					
Has plaintiff pr	oven by the preparation	onderance of the	evidence tha	t he and defend	lant Mohammad
Abdelhadi were in	a partnership toge	ther?		· with dozone	iant Monaminao
Yes V	λſ				
		0			
Has plaintiff	proven by the p	reponderance o	f the evidence	e that dafamal	and Mall
workings of cucifor	l his fiduciary dut	y as a partner, in	violation of 5	0-73.102(R) an	ant Mohammad
Annotated?	,			- v= v= v= (2) an	id (D) VA. Code
Yes	N.	o			
		J			
Has plaintiff p	proven by the pr	eponderance of	the evidenc	e that defends	ont Makessa 1
Abdelhadi was unju	stly enriched?	•		c that defends	iii Monammad
Yes					
1 es	No		-		•
If yes, we award the	e plaintiff:				
	E-average.				
78500					
10,000	damages _	= /11/1000	Sum	4 70 0	
s 78,500 + legal fee	25	impy	JUHI	# 37,2	50 from
عي ، ، دو	- -			Malaaria	and M 1 44 /
				rionamn	100 Modelland

Case 1:10-cv-01048-JCC -IDD Document 52 Filed 06/27/11 Page 3 of 3 PageID# 331

2. Has plaintiff proven by the preponderance of the evidence that there was a contract between Mohammed Khader and Omar Lazkani?					
	Yes	No			
	Has plaintiff proven breached the contract?	by the preponderance of the evidence that defendant Omar Lazkani			
	Yes	No			
	Has plaintiff proven Lazkani were in a partner	by the preponderance of the evidence that he and defendant Omar ship together?			
	Yes	No			
	Has plaintiff prover breached his fiduciary of Annotated?	by the preponderance of the evidence that defendant Omar Lazkani duty as a partner in violation of 50-73.102(B) and (D) VA. Code			
	Yes	No			
	Has plaintiff proven unjustly enriched?	by the preponderance of the evidence that defendant Omar Lazkani was			
	Yes	No			
	If yes, we award the plair	itiff:			
24	s 78,500 + legal fees	damages = lump sum \$39,250 from Omar Lazkani			
特別を表われる。					